

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	E	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/645,773		08/21/2003	Hidehiko Kawaguchi	KAMMON 3.0-069 CONT 8770		
530	7590	02/16/2005		EXAMINER		
•		LITTENBERG,	CARRILLO, BII	CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN		
KRUMHOI 600 SOUTI				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WESTFIEL		-		1746		

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- // _/ /
	10/645,773	KAWAGUCHI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sharidan Carrillo	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	ication appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address	,
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum sit - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- nunication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON- will, by statute, cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communicat ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	lion.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 21 August 2003		
	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition	/ 	ers, prosecution as to the merits	is
•	ce under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.		
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the a	application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restrict	etion and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the	e Evaminer		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		ov the Evaminer	
	ction to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan		
	the correction is required if the drawing(1(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to	•		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 LLS C &	119(a)-(d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	ior foreign priority under 55 6.5.6. §	119(a)-(u) 01 (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in Ap	oplication No. <u>09531716</u> .	
3. Copies of the certified copies	of the priority documents have been	received in this National Stage	
application from the Internatio	nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office actio	n for a list of the certified copies not r	eceived.	
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P 	4) L Interview St	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
 Notice of Dratisperson's Patent Brawing Review (P3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12222003</u> .	6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 8 are indefinite because it is unclear what is meant by "pure water".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by King (4599116).

King teaches a method of employing an aqueous alkaline cleaner for cleaning of aluminum container surfaces. King teaches that it is desirable to subsequently rinse an alkaline cleaned surface with an aqueous based neutral or acidulated rinse solution at a controlled pH to remove residual cleaning solution there from where after it is subjected to further treatments as may be desired or required. In order to avoid any buildup in alkalinity, it is been found necessary to effect an overflow of the rinse and or a neutralization of alkaline buildup such as by the addition of an acid to maintain the pH of

Art Unit: 1746

the rinse solution at a pH about 7. By maintaining the subsequent water rinse solutions at a neutral or acid pH, the formation of brown stains on the aluminum container bodies is substantially eliminated (col. 7, lines 15-37, col. 12, lines 1-12). Example 4 teaches continuous rinses in a pilot washer. In col. 6, lines 50-51 teaches contacting of the substrate by immersion. The limitations of producing of salt would inherently be met by the teachings of King since King teaches performing the same method steps.

Additionally, it is notoriously well known in the art that salts are produced by acid-base reactions (6759184, 6489353). In reference to claims 2, 4, 9 and 11, refer to col. 7, lines 20-30.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1-3, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biebl (US2001/0047815).

Biebl et al. teach a method of treating substrates in a container containing a treatment fluid, the method comprising providing a cleaned wafer previously cleaned with DHF, placing the wafer in a container, introducing a rinsing fluid, wherein the rinsing fluid overflows to displace the treatment fluid (col. 2, paragraphs 23-30). The

Application/Control Number: 10/645,773

Art Unit: 1746

rinsing fluid is further displaced by an SCI solution. The limitations of providing a salt would inherently be met by the teachings of Biebl since Biebl teaches performing the same method steps. Additionally, it is notoriously well known in the art that salts are produced by acid-base reactions (6759184, 6489353). In reference to claims 2, 3, and 10, refer to paragraphs 29-30. In reference to claim 7, refer to paragraph 9. In reference to claim 9, refer to paragraph 27.

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Application/Control Number: 10/645,773

Art Unit: 1746

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 5-6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebl et al. (US2001/0047815) and further in view of Schulz (5853491).

Biebl teaches the neutralizing chemical liquid comprising an aqueous ammonia solution. Biebl et al. fail to teach the limitations of claims 5-6 and 12. Biebl fail to specifically teach cleaning the wafer with an ammonia-hydrogen peroxide or sulfuric acid/hydrogen peroxide solution. Schulz teaches cleaning silicon wafers to remove contaminants. Fig. 1 teaches it is conventional and commonly known in the art to use SC1 and SC2 solutions in the semiconductor manufacturing process. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Biebl to include SC1 and SC2 solutions, as taught by Schultz which are conventionally used in the semiconductor manufacturing process.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nagamura et al. teach a method of cleaning a photomask.

Olesen et al. and Matthews teach semiconductor cleaning using a single vessel. Kume et al. teach RCA cleaning.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharidan Carrillo whose telephone number is 571-272-1297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:00a.m-2:30pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,773

Art Unit: 1746

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

or more unconductive to the control of the control

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharidan Carrillo Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

bsc

SHARIDAN CARRILLO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6